DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 246 230 CE 039 239

TITLE Proceedings: Annual Conference of the Council on the Continuing Education Unit (1st, Memphis, Tennessee, June 21-22, 1979).
INSTITUTION Council on the Continuing Education Unit, Silver Spring, Md.
PUB DATE Jun 79
NOTE 70p.; These Proceedings do not contain all presentations at the conference.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Conference Proceedings; *Continuing Education; *Continuing Education Units; *Educational Research; Higher Education; Professional Continuing Education; Recordkeeping; Required Courses; *Research Needs; *Student Evaluation; *Student Records

ABSTRACT

These nine presentations are intended for the benefit of those organizations and institutions offering or proposing to offer the continuing education unit (CEU). Paul J. Grogan discusses the need for the CEU and its worth. Considering the CEU from the perspective of higher education, Grover J. Andrews lists criteria required in the development and utilization of a CEU plan, describes groups interested in the CEU, and identifies three cautions for the providers. Josephine Darmstaetter considers the CEU from the perspective of the professions, focusing on the adoption of the CEU by the National Federation of Licensed Practical Nurses. Audrey F. Spector suggests opportunities for Council members to strengthen continuing education through effective use of the CEU. John R. Valley reviews CEU research, reports findings of a survey on research needs, and makes suggestions regarding the Council's future research role. Jewell R. Calderon describes procedures set up by Virginia Commonwealth University for awarding CEUs. Suggestions for CEU recordkeeping and reporting are the focus of Lloyd L. Joyner's paper. Irma Bolte discusses CEU participant evaluation and quality assurance with continuing nursing education as the frame of reference. Louis E. Phillips addresses the status of mandatory continuing education. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED246230

PROCEEDINGS

THE FIRST ANNUAL CONFERENCE
OF THE
COUNCIL ON THE CONTINUING EDUCATION UNIT

MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE

June 21-22, 1979

CE039239

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R Glancy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Continuing Education Unit

Council on the Continuing Education Unit

Officers
William L. Turner, President
North Carolina State University at Raleigh
John W. Enell, Vice President
American Management Associations
Keith E. Glancy, Secretary
The Johns Hopkins University
Leonard R. Brice, Treasurer
American Society for Personnel Administration

Board of Directors
Jerry Anderson
Holiday Inn University
Charles W. Fotis
Department of Defense
Paul J. Grogan
University of Wisconsin
Lloyd L. Joyner, Jr.
Georgia Southern College
David Leaman
American Society for Quality Control
Anita Madison
Bank Administration Institute
Vincent A. Miller
Whirlpool Corporation
Louis E. Phillips
Furman University
John A. Rhodes, Jr.
Memphis State University
Audrey F. Specter
Southern Regional Education Board
John R. Valley
Educational Testing Service

These Proceedings do not contain all addresses or presentations at the First Annual Conference of the Council on the Continuing Education Unit. Some of the presenters used visuals or spoke extemporaneously; hence, their presentations are not included. These nine presentations hopefully will be of benefit to those institutions or organizations who were not represented at the annual meeting and also for those organizations and institutions offering the CEU or to anyone proposing to offer the CEU.

It is the desire of the Council to be helpful in any way possible in the better understanding of and implementation of the CEU in non-credit continuing education. Please feel free to contact any of the presenters of these papers should you feel a need to do so, or to contact any of the members of the Board of Directors of the Council should you have questions regarding the Proceedings or the CEU in general.

W. L. Turner

William L. Turner, President
Council on the Continuing
Education Unit

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Continuing Education and the CEU 1
by Paul J. Grogan

CEU Perspectives and Issues: Higher Education 10
by Grover J. Andrews

CEU Perspectives and Issues: The Professions 17
by Josephine Darmstaetter

Responsibility of Members to the Council 23
by Audrey F. Spector

CEU Research Needs and Issues 25
by John R. Valley

Getting Started With the CEU 37
by Jewell R. Calderon

CEU Record Keeping and Reporting 42
by Lloyd L. Joyner

CEU Participant Evaluation and Quality Assurance 50
by Irma Bolte

The Status of Mandatory Continuing Education 56
by Louis E. Phillips

CONTINUING EDUCATION AND THE CEU

/Paul J. Grogan, Professor of Engineering/
/University Extension, THE UNIVERSITY OF/
/WISCONSIN, Madison, Wisconsin -- 53706 /

* * * * * * *

Introduction

Lord Kelvin, world-famed physicist and theoretician, who started out in life in Belfast as plain William Thomson, once wrote:

> When you cannot measure what you are speaking about, when you cannot express it in numbers, your knowledge is of a meager and unsatisfactory kind; it may be the beginning of knowledge but you have scarcely in your thoughts advanced to the stage of science, whatever the matter may be.

Thus we start with the premise that measurement is a prelude to understanding, meaning and usage of any phenomenon whatsoever. It is surprising, in that light, that the broad spectrum of non-credit learning activities -- both in and out of universities -- existed so long and developed so far without some consistent unit of measure. It were as if all commerce and industry were conducted in terms of "yea much" and various gesticulated quantities.

Continuing Education (Re)defined

A first step in the direction of quantifying noncredit learning experiences was made when the original ad hoc task force on what was to become the CEU began to refer more or less consistently to a host of worthy educational opportunities as continuing education, although this terminology has been used to describe credit programs that were often conducted in the evening college and for other than full-time students. I should add, by note of apology, that this more narrow usage of the language by the original task

force on the CEU was never really adjudicated with respect to these other bona fide users thereof.

Your keynote speaker has just made a case for the "importance of lifelong learning in today's world."* If anything, we are late with our perception of the role of continuing education to accomplish this purpose.

Enter the Continuing Education Unit

The actual birth of the continuing education unit -- now commonly known as CEU or "q" -- as further appropriate terminology for "the uniform measure of participation in continuing education," actually rivalled the elephant for its gestation period. Even at that, the initial coining of the terminology did not entail a workable definition. That came about later and is still subject to debate in important circles, including many who are represented here. The ten-hour module, because of its decimal properties and which came about almost as a split-second decision in the delivery room, has perhaps withstood the test of time better than other attributes of the CEU, particularly performance evaluation.

As an aside, the question is often asked: "Why ten hours, why not simply hours?" But here we are dealing with an educational unit, of which there are already several in existence that are defined on the term-hour basis, where that term ranges from nine to 19 weeks. My early instincts in this regard favored a 12-hour unit. This probably stemmed from my lifelong familiarity with eggs and do-nuts

*Jule Sugarman, Deputy Director, Office of Personnel Management, Washington, D. C., keynote address, The First Annual Conference on the Continuing Education Unit, Hyatt Regency, Memphis, Tennessee, June 21, 1979.

by the dozen and the early recognition of 12 inches to the foot. The concession to the decimal base, ten, probably erred in the sense of inflating the intrinsic value of the CEU in relation to other established units -- for example, the Carnegie unit from secondary education and the quarter-hour, the trimester-hour and the semester-hour from higher education.

Man-hours, on the other hand, now itself an obsolete term, most often have their application in training situations involving trade skills in the examples of apprenticeship programs and military specializations. I am strongly of the opinion that continuing education, now and even more so in the future, relates more closely to traditional academic situations than to skills' preparation such as radio operator, welding or flying. In particular, any recognition that flows from the systematic pursuit of continuing education should not be based on an exhibit of hours in multiple humdreds that would appear to put to shame any diploma or degree ever earned.

The CEU and the Sponsoring Organization

The CEU has now survived a somewhat checkered existence for virtually a decade. Yet it has scarcely begun to serve the need for which it was intended. Keep in mind that it was never intended to superimpose the CEU onto well-meaning and well-run educational activities in any sense of introducing either change or constraints. I go back again to Lord Kelvin and the science of measurement. The ideal measurement does not affect the phenomenon being observed. This is difficult of attainment in many situations, but we do measure the light or the distance of a star without altering either its luminosity or its course.

My thesis is that CEU exist wherever continuing education is conducted and whether or not the sponsoring organization traffics in CEU. At the gut level, I say CEU exists in association with a noncredit learning experience just as any rock picked up at random in nature has a definable length along its principal axis. Yet that dimension is scarcely an apt description of the total properties or worth of the stone. No single quantitative measure can say a whole lot about that rock, just as a two-credit notation on a transcript does not say a whole lot about the course of instruction from which the credit was earned.

The quality aspects of any learning experience derive in the first instance from the source of sponsorship and the esteem with which it is held by society. This latter intangible is often represented by the accreditations the sponsoring organization holds. Intangible as it may be, I would say the general reputation and esteem of the source is really more important than the accreditations that can be attached to their imprimatur. Of real importance is what goes on in the classroom once the starting bell rings and the door closes behind the instructor. The accreditation goes with the hallowed traditions and the ivy for what they are worth.

The quality aspects of a continuing education program is scarcely something that can be assured by a blanket accreditation. Neither is it possible to bring in a peer group from outside to accredit an annual slate of continuing education courses that are topically attuned to the needs of the day.

Thus it comes down to the fact that the quality built into each program is either developed in the course of the planning

of the offering or it has but the general aura of the sponsor's reputation at large. This, after all, is the free-enterprise way.

The Criteria and Standards on the CEU, as developed originally by the task force and now updated by the Council on the CEU, go along with the simple, but not unusual, linear measure of an educational unit. This is where many people part company with the CEU. They ask, and rightly, how can this one incidential number be a measure of anything significant or permanent? I would suggest, however, that all formal accounting of education is done in such linear accretions. Behind such prosaic yardsticks are the reputation of the institution and the standards to which it adheres. Beyond that is even another overlay of the curriculum which is inviolate, particularly before recognition is conferred upon the individual. I will have more to say a little later about the parallel of the curriculum where continuing education is used.

The original purpose of the CEU was to achieve "a uniform measure nationally for recognition of participation in noncredit continuing education." My point is that whether we debate or doubt the CEU, we cannot deny the need for a unit to meet the above objective. As continuing education is used more and more to meet any of twenty* or more clear societal needs, the mandate

*remedial education; base level knowledge or skills for initial hire in a given line of work; job orientation; survey; technological or scientific literacy; familiarization with new procedures, standards, codes, statutes or regulations; on-the-job training; refresher; advancement; retreading; entrance or membership requirements; grade of membership; licensure or certification; relicensure or recertification; promotion; merit; horizontal transfer; combatting obsolescence; maintaining pace with change; crash programs dealing with emergency situations; avocational interests; cultural enhancement; organizational or civic awards; etc.

becomes all the more clear for a recordable, transferable and potentially accumulative measure of individual pursuit of one or another of these worthy needs.

It was not the purpose of the humble task force to approve either sponsoring organizations that potentially number in tens of thousand -- 2500 in higher education alone -- or the hundreds of thousands of noncredit programs they are capable of conducting each year. Bear in mind that in-plant learning experiences of a proprietary nature might well carry CEU for career development purposes just as surely as a broad-area survey course offered at the local community college, library or church. What certification scheme can bridge this gap as well as visit every community in America?

The CEU and the User Group

The expression is now trite, but there is no escaping that "the utility of a particular CEU -- for the specific recognition purpose intended -- is clearly in the eyes of the beholder." A sharp change in either the place of employment or the thrust of a career and the proprietary course alluded to above loses virtually all of its relevance. This example serves merely to point up that the worth of any particular CEU can be no better than its source and the care that goes into its planning and execution. But beyond that, the application of CEU toward the satisfaction of a career goal depends upon both its aptness and the degree to which the individual can demonstrate some improvement toward the attainment of that goal. Disinterested third parties should not quarrel

with the concept of quality control in the marketplace, particularly in the individual performance against a set of norms, anymore than they should concern themselves with every plane geometry course in America that contributes toward a high school diploma.

The distinction I make for various user groups who seek to satisfy their need through the mechanism of continuing education and the concomitant accumulation of CEU is that they establish and monitor compliance insofar as their "curriculum" is concerned. By "curriculum" in this context, I now mean the broad set of objectives to be met in terms of an individual satisfying the requirements for recognition in such examples as my list of twenty or more goals to be served through continuing education as well as by a host of other mechanisms and overt signs of personal development. Here I have reference to formal education, work experience, on-the-job performance, record of advancement and ability to adapt to increased level of responsibility, other demonstrated leadership qualities, patents, publications, presentations, awards, peer esteem, manifested growth potential, memberships, as well as offices and committee assignments therein, civic activities, etc.

CEU and the Human Condition

Although every human existence runs its course as a linear phenomenon, every one of us lives in an exponential world. Thus, we have seen the world population double since WW-II and threaten to double again by early next century. We have seen the demand for both electrical and petroleum energy increase 32-fold since the depression and threaten to leave a spent and polluted world in the lifetime of our children. Otherwise, how can we compound

that already-large number several times more? One way will be throughout a lifetime of concerted effort, either to solve such monumental problems or the better to cope with harsh realities.

The same cruel facts confront us educationally. Although the mind has its limits -- again a linear quantity -- the fund of knowledge doubles several times in the course of a career. Three doublings and a little loss of recall and the static practitioner is 90 percent obsolete in his field. Realization of these facts alone is sufficient to spell the need for giving both substance and structure to post-diploma, post-baccalaureate and postgraduate studies.

Given such demonstrated need for the lifelong use of continuing education as one* means of maintaining pace with change, the CEU permits an individual accounting to be made of effort directed to withstand the ravages of time. To be sure, CEU are accounted in their own terms, but what other terms are there to accomplish this broad need on a uniform basis nationally, in fact, if not internationally? The CEU can evolve to become whatever society will make of it. Indeed, it should be implicit in any meaningful recognition based in substantial part on CEU that there is quality associated with quantity. We sometimes overlook the

*There are other, equally important, avenues available that are often used for self-development in the absence of appreciable dependence upon continuing education as a means of maintaining proficiency as well as updating. For example: formal education; work experience; on-the-job training; tutorials administered by supervisors or others; self-study; selective reading; membership in organizations; participation in meetings, trade shows, field trips and demonstrations; peer exchanges; purposeful travel; etc.

fact that most continuing education is offered with three specific parameters in mind. These are: audience, purpose and content. The CEU associated with these three broad aims is of less importance than the care that is exerted in fulfillment of the three basic foundation stones upon which the educational opportunity is built.

The CEU in Perspective

A review of a presentation made eight years ago before a national meeting of registered nurses, reveals a listing of freedoms and constraints relative to the award of CEU for recognition purposes.

A. Constraints in the Award of CEU

1) Bona fide sponsor, with a charter and a commitment to excellence.
2) Able administration, course direction and instruction.
3) Organized around a stated objective.
4) Entail some degree of individual participation.
5) Performance evaluation of greater or lesser depth.
6) Maintenance of an accessible and transferable record.

B. Freedoms in the Award of CEU

1) Audience, purpose and content, with scope implied.
2) Level, consistent with the above, particularly the audience.
3) Format.
4) Locale, facility, fee, time-of-day, etc.
5) Duration, consistent with scope and objective.
6) Accreditation or certification, e.g., by the user group.
7) Choice of qualified instructor.

* * * * * * *

Madison, Wisconsin
June 13, 1979

CEU Perspectives and Issues:
Higher Education

When the Continuing Education Unit (CEU) emerged on the American postsecondary scene about eleven years ago in the summer of 1968 it was hailed as a long overdue and desired system to provide due recognition for the millions of adults involved annually in some form of continuing education. The welcome extended to the CEU was enthusiastic and shared by all three of the projected user groups--business and industry, the professions, and institutions of higher education. There were also present the skeptics and critics, many of whom are still with us today.

Because of the importance of a clear understanding of the nature and structure of the CEU, let me briefly review:

The Continuing Education Unit (CEU) is a unit of measure that was created by a national task force of educational, business, and professional leaders in 1968 for the purpose of providing a validating unit of recognition for continuing education experiences of individuals for personal, professional or educational purposes.

The CEU is defined thusly:

One continuing education unit is "Ten contract hours of participation in an organized continuing education experience under responsible sponsorship, capable direction, and qualified instruction."

While the unit itself is a quantative measure (10 contact hours = 1)

The criteria for implementation and utilization of the CEU provide the framework for improved planning in continuing education course and program planning, and for an improved quality assurance in continuing education courses and programs.

There are at least seven criteria that are required in the development and utilization of a CEU plan for continuing education programs. They are:

1. The activity is planned in response to an assessment of educational need for a specific target population or group;
2. There is a statement of objectives and rationale;
3. Program or course content is selected and is organized in a sequential manner;
4. There is evidence of pre-planning which should include opportunity for input by a representative of the target group to be served, the faculty area having content expertise, and continuing education personnel.
5. The activity is of an instructional nature and is sponsored or approved by an academic or administrative visit of the institution or organization best qualified to affect the quality of the program content and to approve the resource personnel utilized;
6. There is a provision for registration for individual participants and tc provide data for reporting; and

7. Appropriate evaluation procedures are utilized and criteria are established for awarding CEU's to individual students prior to the beginning of the activity. This may include the evaluation of student performance, instructional procedures, and course effectiveness.

In some cases for systems of higher education where some form of funding, direct or indirect, is based on the CEU an eighth criteria has been added to the above, which is, "There should be an annual audit made of both programs and financial information."

In the first decade of the CEU--1968-1978--its adoption and use across the country has been relatively widespread by all intended users--educational institutions, professional groups, and business and industry. Literally hundreds of educational institutions are now recording the CEU (450 in the South alone); over 100 professional agencies, societies or organizations; and a large and unknown quantity of business and industry units. Thousands of individuals across the country have begun to receive and accumulate CEU records for personal or professional use. At least two state departments of education now formally allow teachers who have met the degree requirements for teacher certification to submit CEU courses for up-grading, promotion and recertification purposes.

The question may very well be asked by many,

"Who Cares?" Many different and diverse groups do--and the list is growing every day.

1. First and foremost are the thousands of individuals who have earned CEU's in recognition for their continuing education

courses and programs successfully completed. Many of these are for personal reasons and enrichment, many are for professional and career change or advancement purposes.

2. Professional organizations, agencies and societies--who have found in the CEU a useful and reliable measure of a members continued pursuit of knowledge that is career related and can validate such for licensing, certification or the re-licensing or certification in a practicing profession. Over a hundred such organizations are making such a use--e.g. nursing, accounting, real estate, radiology-technologist, to name a few examples.
3. State licensing and certification (requirements) groups--boards and others set up by state law.
4. Business and industry who have found the CEU a useful and meaningful internal system for organizing and recording personnel in-service as well as external educational achievements that are job related and may be used for advancement purposes.
5. Educational institutions that have found the use of the CEU as
   (1) an enhancement and attraction for adult students to their continuing educational programs,
   (2) an internal accounting system for recognition of their efforts in institutional processes and where applicable for funding.

6. Accrediting associations who have found the use of the CEU as a means for improvement in planning and program quality of continuing education that is institutionally based.

There are probably many others who genuinely care--but these are the major ones and provide a significant base for "caring."

The development and advancement of the CEU has not been as rosy as my previous remarks may have lead you to believe. There have been many opponents to the concept--some who fear that the development of the measure may lead to a standardization and thereby may inhibit innovation or may delay the responsiveness--time-factor--of continuing education. While the lack of understanding, or an inadequately developed CEU process may produce some of these factors, the occurance of them is not inherent to the use of the CEU.

The future for the CEU appears to be very good--its use will continue to expand and as the body of experience grows from its use, a refinement and enhancement of the use and meaning of the CEU should transpire to the benefit of all who are involved and concerned.

In conclusion let me briefly identify three issues or cautions:

Cautions

1. Careful attention must be given by the providers to the criteria--a full and thorough address and implementation according to the provision and requirements of the criteria must be made.
2. The co-mixing and mingling of the CEU with credit hour carrying courses must be avoided.

The CEU must not be considered as a consolation prize for those students enrolled in credit courses who audit.

Each--and both, the CEU and Credit-hour courses are different and discreet units of measure, with different meanings, criteria, and purposes.

3. Though the CEU was designed for three basic user groups, therefore three potential disseminating groups--educational institutions, professional associations and organizations, and business and industry--where possible and compatible relationships can be established to the mutual advantage of the parties concerned--other disseminating and user groups should develop their CEU awarding functions in cooperation with an educational institution that has a commitment to CE and that is properly organized for the planning, delivery, and recording of CEU's.

   This type of arrangment in the long run has the most potential for the quality assurance factors of integrity and meaning for the CEU, to the maximum advantage and utility of the CEU's earned for the individual student.

The CEU student is entitled to and deserves the best possible quality in his or her educational experiences.

While the institutions of higher education must be responsible for the integrity of their own use of the CEU, a major concern also exists by

the institutions that the other providers--business and industry and the professions--maintain the quality of the unit. While this responsibility must be shared by all providers, a major share of the responsibility rests with the Council on the Continuing Education Unit.

Remarks by
Grover J. Andrews
Associate Executive Secretary
Commission on Colleges
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools

Memphis, Tennessee
June 21, 1979
First Annual Conference of the
Council on the Continuing Education Unit

First Annual Conference

The Council on Continuing Education Unit

Presentation by Josephine Darmstaetter

on the panel CEU Perspectives and Issues

In 1968, NFLPN established an Achievement Point Program as a method of recognizing and rewarding achievement in continuing education. This step was taken because NFLPN, as the professional organization exclusively for LP/VNs, realized that there had to be some system whereby individual LP/VNs would be encouraged to participate in continuing education activities for personal and professional development. The organization had been aware for some time of the growing need for updating and expanding the basic core of knowledge and skill which the LP/VN received through her practical nursing education program.

It was at about the same time thata heightened awareness of broader national needs in continuing education resulted in the appointment of a thirteen-member National Task Force on Continuing Education which was charged with the development of a uniform unit of measurement of individual participation in continuing education. From 1968 to 1974 The Task Force worked

to develop criteria and guidelines, and tested the concept of the continuing education unit in pilot projects in fourteen institutions of higher learning. Final criteria and guidelines were issued by the Task Force in 1974.

In that same year, the House of Delegates of the National Federation of Licensed Practical Nurses adopted the standards of the Continuing Education Unit (CEU) with the following resolution:

> Whereas, New knowledge and new technologies are emerging at an increasingly rapid rate within the health care system, and
>
> Whereas, Continuing education is essential for maintaining competence in nursing practice, and
>
> Whereas, Continuing education provides one means of assuring the public of nurses' accountability for competence in nursing practice.
>
> Resolved, That The National Federation of Licensed Practical Nurses adopt the standards of the National Task Force on the Continuing Education Unit (CEU) in measuring participation in continuing education.

In this action it was perceived that both qualitative and quantitative advantages could accrue from the use of the CEU System by NFLPN. Even though the Achievement Point Program recognized and rewarded participation in continuing education, it did not measure

program criteria in any fashion. Also, the administrative procedures were insufficiently sophisticated to assure accountability.

In order to implement this resolution, NFLPN appointed a CEU Approval Committee and employed a director of continuing education. By the fall of 1976, the procedures for operation of the CEU system had been set up and the new system was inaugurated. Included in the administrative process now in use are provisions for assessing continuing education under the CEU criteria and standards; determining the number of units to be awarded; verification that the performance requirements have been met by each participant; maintenance of a computerized permanent record-keeping system.

Forms have been prepared for use in the administrative process. The Application for Program Approval is a computer form from which the pertinent information is gleaned for computer input. Supportive data must accompany this form in order to substantiate the quality of the program objectives, content, instructional methods, background of the instructors, and evaluative processes. Each application is carefully reviewed and evaluated before approval is given and a coded program number assigned. The codes can be translated into titles which reflect program content.

The form entitled PARTICIPANT REPORT is used to provide the information needed for entering the proper number of units in

the individual LP/VN's permanent record. Copies of this form are sent to the program director when program approval is given. The name, address, and CEU registration number for each program participant must be filled in accurately. The program director must verify that all who are listed have met the established program requirements. The form must be signed by the program director.

A computerized permanent CEU record is automatically established free of charge for members upon receipt of membership dues in NFLPN office.

LP/VNs who are not NFLPN members may establish a CEU record by filing an APPLICATION FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF A RECORD and paying a $25.00 registration fee. To keep such a record active, a non-member must pay an annual maintenance fee of $15. Transcripts of the Units credited to an individual's CEU record are sent to persons and agencies upon authorization of the record holder. A form entitled REQUEST FOR TRANSCRIPT must be filed for each transcript desired. Transcripts are not released without the signature of the registered participant. This protects the individual record from unauthorized distribution. The first transcript is provided free of charge. Thereafter, a nominal fee is charged for each transcript requested.

Each person holding a Data Bank Account receives a computer print-out annually listing the basic information that was entered into the individual's record, namely, the program title, location, date of completion, CEUs awarded.

NFLPN's CEU data bank has been programmed to produce statistics which should be helpful to individual LP/VNs as well as to program providers. An annual Data Bank Report is published and distributed. Included in this report are figures and tables showing: the total number of LP/VN participants; a breakdown of LP/VN participants by states and regions; a breakdown by states and regions of the number and kind of programs presented; the number of CEUs awarded. The Data Bank Report can be used not only to take a look at where we have been in continuing education but also to point to new and better directions for the future.

The statistics for the second year of operation under the CEU system showed definite growth in the use of the Data Bank. In the first fifteen months of operation (September 1, 1976 - December 31, 1977) slightly more than 76 programs were approved per month for a total of 1145 programs. During the twelve months period from January 1, 1978 - December 31, 1978, about 87 programs were approved per month for a total of 1040 persons. In the first fifteen months under the CEU System, 6187 persons had some recorded activity. In 1978 (twelve months), 7757 persons had recorded activities. Many persons had more than one activity recorded resulting in a total of 13,985 entries in the Data Bank for the year. Approximately 40% of the members of NFLPN had some recorded activity in 1978.

Continuing Education is a fact of life for an increasing number of professions. At least ten states have passed laws mandating proof of continuing education as a requirement for relicensure of LP/VNs. But even without laws which demand proof of continuing education, dedicated nurses realize that it is imperative to evaluate their professional strengths and weaknesses and plan a continuing education strategy for personal growth and professional development.

NFLPN is honored to have been accepted into Charter membership in the Council on the Continuing Education Unit and looks forward to participation in its activities as it carries out its stated purposes.

Remarks by Audrey F. Spector at First Annual Conference of
the COUNCIL ON THE CONTINUING EDUCATION UNIT
Panel Presentation
June 21, 1979

RESPONSIBILITY OF MEMBERS TO THE COUNCIL

Members of the Council represent a wide variety of agencies and institutions and we each bring a different perspective to the Council. We are a remarkably diverse group, but we have a common goal: to strengthen continuing education through effective use of the continuing education unit.

My purpose for the next 5 minutes or so is to suggest some opportunities for each member to help achieve our common goal.

I have identified 3 broad categories of opportunity (or responsibility) that each member has.

1. Communicate with each other.

Because we come from so many different perspectives, we may have to work hard to understand and appreciate each other's point of view. There are several opportunities for communication:

a) Discussions at this annual conference and at the Council business meeting.
b) You can talk with members of the board, at this conference, or write or call, if you have a concern, a question, suggestion, or if you would like to offer to help work on a specific problem.
c) Use the Newsletter. If you have conducted a study and want to report it, or want to write an article for the Newsletter, write or call the president or the editor, and explore you idea.
d) If you or your organization has a specific strength, let it be known. The Council seeks to engage in research and other cooperative studies; perhaps you might explore ideas for cooperative studies with the Council.

2. Help to build Council membership.

There is strength in members. I know the Council will continue to grow in membership; it already has grown remarkably. But it will grow faster if we each help.

a) Tell our friends and colleagues about the Council and invite them to join.

b) Share the Council's brochure with friends.
c) Pass on the Newsletter; circulate it to others in your organization so more people will be informed about the Council.
d) Volunteer to help make it easy for persons to get application forms -- send your friend's address to Keith Glancy, the secretary, and ask that membership application forms be sent to them. Or use the application form in the back of criteria and guidelines booklet.
e) Most important, we need to spread the word that there are 3 <u>different</u> types of membership -- <u>individual</u>, <u>affiliate</u>, and <u>institutional</u> membership. We will each need to refer to our Council brochure and to the by-laws, to interpret for ourselves and others what is involved in each type of membership.

3. Encouraging the effective use of the CEU.

a) We can each interpret to others how to use the CEU, its purpose, and we can be alert to misuses of the CEU, for example, in other organizations to which we belong.
b) We can also be alert for the use of the CEU certification mark. That is the logo institutional members of the Council are authorized to use under the auspices of the Council. I expect there will be questions about use of that mark, and as members we can help create understanding about its use and significance.
c) We can be alert for problem areas in use of the CEU that need attention.

In short, we can each help the Council by sharing information with our fellow members and expressing freely our views and interests; we can help by recruiting members for the Council, and we can help promote use of the guidelines and criteria for the CEU.

I look forward to my association with you in this Council.

CEU RESEARCH NEEDS AND ISSUES

Presentation by John R. Valley at the First Annual Meeting of the Council on the Continuing Education Unit, June 1979, Memphis, Tennessee.

It may seem incongruous to discuss CEU research needs and issues. Afterall the CEU is a measure of continuing education. With regard to other measures, we do not expect to find people engaged in research. As far as I know no one is studying the acre, the cubic centimeter, the gallon, or the hour. So how can we and why should we research the CEU?

With regard to the common measures that I just mentioned, these measures do not change the matter to which they are applied. A parcel of farmland or a part of a swamp is still pretty much the same before and after we establish how many acres each contains. However, one of the major reasons for studying the CEU is the expectation that this measure may be exerting some profound influence, or that it may have the potential for impacting upon and changing, the very thing it is supposed to measure. Those who know the CEU anticipate that its standards call for quality continuing education. If this expectation can be realized, then research on the CEU ceases being merely interesting. Instead it becomes a vitally important and central concern not only for the Council on the CEU but also for all providers, all consumers and all participants in continuing education.

In the balance of my remarks, I plan to review the character of research to date and then I will report on findings of a survey ETS conducted for the Council on the CEU in 1977. I shall conclude with suggestions regarding the Council's future research role.

A review of doctoral dissertations reveals first that very few have been concerned with the CEU. Of the five dissertations I have identified, two were written by speakers at this conference -- John Rhodes and Lou Phillips. They, each, completed their work in 1973. Rhodes and Phillips were pioneers.

Rhodes' dissertation, done at Georgia State University, was titled The Utilization of the Continuing Education Unit in Conferences, Institutes, Short Courses, Workshops, Seminars, and Special Training Programs Within the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Using a Delphi technique, Rhodes went to 50 educational leaders in the South and developed a series of forecasts regarding the CEU by 1980. If you believe in the concept of the self-fulfilling prophecy, you can look at Rhodes' work as an illustration of how studying the CEU might serve to stimulate change in continuing education.

Lou Phillips' dissertation was A Study of the Uses and Effects of the Continuing Education Unit Within Selected User Groups. His work was done at the University of Georgia. Phillips examined present and potential uses of the CEU in five fields:

- o Medical profession and allied health fields
- o Engineering professions
- o Labor Unions
- o Business and Industry
- o Govermental agencies.

Among Phillips' findings was that by the early 1970s information about the CEU had gotten to the grassroots level sporadically and in only a limited number of groups. He indicated that the absence of information and national guidelines was limiting adoption of the CEU. A year after his dissertation, the first printing appeared of Criteria and Guidelines by the National Task Force on the CEU.

Two years later, in 1975, William Piper completed his dissertation at the University of Georgia. It was A Comparative Survey of the Continuing Education Unit and Its Implementation and Utilizations In Selected Public Colleges and Universities. Piper focused on the implementation of the CEU in the University System of Georgia and included a comparison of Georgia policies with those of the higher education systems of North Carolina, Virginia, and Florida. At that time Piper concluded that CEU policies in Georgia were more developed, standardized, and implemented than in the other states.

In 1976 Robert Curtis wrote his dissertation at the University of Cincinnati on The Usage of Continuing Education Units In Selected Business Organizations For Determining Employee Recognition. Curtis sent a questionnaire to about 100 personnel officers representing business organizations listed in the Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce Directory, 1975. He inquired about the extent to which employees of these organizations were engaged in continuing education, the use being made of CEU, and knowledge about the CEU. His study reported many findings of interest including that 64% of the personnel officers were not familiar with the CEU prior to the study and that among personnel officers of very small organizations, there was practically no

knowledge of the CEU. Curtis' investigation once again illustrates how researching the CEU changes the situation. Because of Curtis' study, Cincinnati personnel officers developed at least a basic familiarity with CEU that they had not had previously.

The last doctoral dissertation is James Hanlin's completed at the University of Pittsburgh in 1977. Its title is The Continuing Education Unit: The Development of Guidelines For Pennsylvania Community Colleges. The purpose of this study was to develop guidelines for the use of the CEU by Pennsylvania community colleges. Hanlin distilled 23 guidelines re CEU by examining procedures at 11 colleges and universities and five associations of colleges and universities. Then he tested these guidelines for acceptance by the highest ranking administrators of noncredit continuing education at each of the fourteen Pennsylvania community colleges. He found support for 21 of 23 proposed guidelines. He also learned that six community colleges were already using CEU and three more had it under advisement.

These five dissertations can be characterized as being primarily concerned with the issue of acceptance of the CEU concept and this issue has been explored among a variety of categories of providers of continuing education. Today the stage is set for additional studies focused on a broader range of issues.

Of course doctoral students are not the only persons engaged in CEU research. In 1970-71 Keith Glancy coordinated a pilot study of fourteen colleges and universities that agreed to experiment with the CEU and to report their experience, problems, and reactions regarding the CEU. The results of this experiment was fed into

further refinement and clarification of the basic publication regarding the CEU issued by the National Task Force in 1974.

Studies of a different sort have been undertaken by the National University Extension Association (NUEA) and the Association For Continuing Higher Education (ACHE) as well as the National Center For Educational Statistics. By 1975-76 the joint report issued by the two educational associations provided information on two aspects of the CEU.

(1) The proportion of noncredit activities awarding CEUs

(2) Program categories in which CEUs were available.

One hundred fifty-two out of 258 reporting institutions indicated they were making some use of the CEU mainly for classes and conferences.

On the other hand the National Center For Educational Statistics (NCES) surveyed a sample of 479 colleges and universities selected to permit national estimates for 1975-76. The center reported that 798 institutions were using the CEU and that an additional 566 institutions were considering its use. The particular significance of this finding was that it showed the CEU was being accepted and used by a broader spectrum of institutions that was represented by NUEA and ACHE.

If we bring the NUEA-ACHE survey together with the NCES study, we can observe that the use of the CEU is much more concentrated among institutions that hold membership in the two major higher continuing education associations than in colleges and universities in general (59% of the former vs 36% of the latter). However, we also need to be aware that currently there is no systematic and comprehensive

information regarding the use being made of CEU by professional associations, or by business, industry, government, and community and social service agencies.

There have been other studies, of course. Perhaps one of the best resources for other references is Long, Huey B. and Lord, Charles B. (ed). The Continuing Education Unit: Concept, Issues, and Uses. Of particular interest is the Overview of the Literature on the CEU, contained therein, written by Anna C. Kaplan and Clive C. Veri. These authors, have reviewed the literature through 1977 for the ERIC Clearinghouse In Career Education. Their summary merits our attention. "The CEU is rapidly becoming accepted by colleges, universities, professional associations, and other user groups. Descriptive articles, reviews, guidelines, sample forms and record keeping systems are now readily available and supply, with considerable duplication, the basic information needed by the novice. Substantive issues concerning the use of the CEU remain unattended. Adult educators and user groups who have followed and promoted the development of the CEU since its inception have a responsibility to address these issues without further delay." (p. 109). Their conclusions are, indeed, rather sobering, and as far as I can tell, the situation has not changed materially in the last two years.

I would like to share with you some information gathered by ETS in 1977 in a survey we conducted on behalf of the Council on the Continuing Education Unit. We went to three major categories of users and providers of continuing education believed to have an interest in the CEU. We contacted 440 colleges and universities

consisting of the members of NUEA and ACHE plus about 50 junior and community colleges not members of these two associations. We also surveyed 175 professional and trade associations and technical societies. And we canvassed a mixed group that I will call "other" consisting of business, industry, government, health and social service organizations. The N for this group was 271.

One section of the survey asked respondents to rate six areas of research - using a scale of 0 meaning of no interest, 1 for some interest, and 2 very interested. The opportunity was provided for the respondent to write in other areas of research of particular interest. The six areas of research interest were:

- o Appropriate applications of the CEU.
- o Development of criteria for judging the effectiveness of continuing education.
- o Studies leading to a handbook or principles of assessment of noncredit continuing education.
- o Use of the CEU for employment or career development.
- o Comprehensive statistics compiled regularly and systematically to indicate the status and trends in the use of the CEU.

Now, keep in mind the audience of the survey was a relatively sophisticated group regarding the CEU -- 76% were either using the CEU or had had adoption of the CEU under active consideration. It is likely therefore that the respondents to the survey may be more, rather than less, like the institutions and organizations that in the meanwhile have become members of the CCEU.

All three groups of respondents were in agreement regarding their first and second choice research area. The first and second

choices were so close in their ratings as to be indistinguishable for all practical purposes. One of the two areas of research of greatest interest was the development of criteria for judging the effectiveness of continuing education. The other was the use of the CEU for employment or career development. (In an earlier report of this survey I had indicated that the three categories of respondents had differed substantially in their interest in research on the use of the CEU for employment or career development. I reworked the data for this presentation and wish to correct my earlier report. All categories of respondents did, indeed, say that research on the use of the CEU for employment or career development was of substantial interest.)

The two areas of research interest that were in the middle were:

- o Research on appropriate applications of the CEU.
- o Studies leading to a handbook or principles of assessment of noncredit continuing education.

These research areas were ranked three and four by the total group of respondents. Of these two areas the three categories of respondents were in less agreement regarding the latter of the two interest areas.

Two topics were at the bottom of the list. Second from the bottom was research on comprehensive statistics compiled regularly and systematically to indicate status and trends in the use of the CEU. The area in last place was research on the efforts of assessment on adult learning and participation.

It is also worth noting that although there were differences in the level of interest across all six areas, all areas of research were of interest to a substantial majority of the respondents. Only one of

the six areas was rated of no interest by as many as 20% of the respondents and that was effects of assessment on adult learning and participation.

To recapitulate, the six research areas were rank ordered as follows:

1. Development of criteria for judging the effectiveness of continuing education.
2. Use of the CEU for employment or career counseling.
3. Appropriate applications of the CEU.
4. Studies leading to a handbook or to principles of assessment of noncredit continuing education.
5. Comprehensive statistics compiled regularly and systematically to indicate the status and trends in the use of the CEU.
6. Effects of assessment on adult learning and participation.

I found the two items at the bottom of the list to be especially significant. Apparently the respondents were agreeing with Kaplan and Veri whose summary statements were cited earlier. The advice offered by the survey to the Council on the CEU is quite clear, namely that the Council should direct its research attention more to substantive issues rather than to the gathering of routine statistical information. However, the fact that the respondents put at the bottom of the list, research on the effects of assessment on adult learning is curious to say the least.

To the extent that there has been controversy about the CEU it has focused on the issue of assessment. There is a segment of the continuing education community who criticize the CEU because its criteria and guidelines do not take a sufficiently strong or unequivical

position regarding the assessment of learning outcomes. While there is a fair amount of controversy and debate, it appears to be an area in which there may be more heat than light. Under the circumstances it is hard to understand why there isn't more support for research on assessment issues in noncredit continuing education. I would personally hope that the Council on the CEU would lend its support and influence to stimulate and encourage research on assessment in continuing education.

What then might be the role of the Council on the Continuing Education Unit regarding research? Obviously this role needs to be couched in terms that recognize the current limited financial and personnel resources of the Council. Nonetheless, there seems to be much that the Council might do.

First, the Council might identify and clarify the significant research issues surrounding the CEU in particular and noncredit continuing education in general. The Council might annually commission three or four thoughtful and insightful analysts to prepare issue papers which could be used as the major foci for the programs of its annual meetings.

Second, the Council might identify research resources and invite representatives of the research community to offer presentations at its annual meetings.

Third, as an extension of the second point, the Council might collect copies of the major CEU related research studies and reports and establish a respority of them. The Council could serve as a

clearinghouse to bring such research to the benefit of the continuing education community.

Fourth, as a further extension of item three, the Council could periodically issue up-to-date bibliographies of writings on various aspects of the CEU. Such bibliographies could be a regular benefit of membership and distributed to recover costs to non-members.

Fifth, the Council could take steps to encourage the applications of research. Its primary target in this instance would be the membership. As we all know there is always a substantial gap between research and the application of research. Thus the Council might sponsor workshops: some at the time of its annual meeting; other workshops could be offered at different times and places. The workshops would be staffed by people with the talent and the experience to translate research into practical applications.

I don't know whether you will agree with the specific suggestion I have made. However, my general point is that there are at least four different roles for the Council vis-a-vis research:

1. Assist the continuing education community to identify the significant researchable issues.
2. Identify research resources that can and are contributing to an understanding and clarification of the research issues.
3. Assist in the dissemination of research.
4. Encourage the application and utilization of research for the betterment of continuing education.

I think it safe to say that the domain of research is one where the Council on the Continuing Education Unit can make a very significant contribution.

References

Curtis, Robert Kent. The Usage of Continuing Education Units In Selected Business Organizations For Determining Employee Recognition. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Cincinnati, 1976. 170 pp.

Glancy, Keith E. The Continuing Education Unit: Three Pilot Project Reports. September 1970 to June 1971, Washington, DC: National University Extension Association, 1971. 16 pp.

Hanlin, James Raymond. The Continuing Education Unit: The Development of Guidelines For Pennsylvania Community Colleges. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1977. 141 pp.

Kanun, Clara and Swanson, Ray H. (eds). Programs and Registrations ACHE-NUEA, 1975-76. Norman, Oklahoma: Association For Continuing Higher Education. 60 pp.

Kaplan, Anne C. and Veri, Clyde C. "An Overview of the Literature on the CEU" in Long and Lord (ed). The Continuing Education Unit: Concept, Issues, and Use. pp. 105-140.

Kemp, Florence B. Noncredit Activities In Institutions Of Higher Education For the Year Ending June 30, 1976. Washington, DC: National Center For Educational Statistics, NCES 78-344. 38 pp.

Long, Huey B. and Lord, Charles B. The Continuing Education Unit: Concept, Issues, and Use. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Center For Continuing Education, 1978. 140 pp.

Phillips, Louis Edwin. A Study of the Uses and Effects of the Continuing Education Unit Within Selected User Groups. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Georgia, 1973. 183 pp.

Piper, William Estill. A Comparatfve Survey of the Continuing Education Unit and Its Implementation and Utilization in Selected Public Colleges and Universities. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Georgia, 1975. 226 pp.

Rhodes, John Augustus. The Utilization of the Continuing Education Unit In Conferences, Institutes, Short Courses, Workshops, Seminars, and Special Training Programs Within the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Doctoral Dissertation, Georgia State University, 1973. 212 pp.

GETTING STARTED WITH THE CEU

Presentation to a Workshop
at
The First Annual Conference of the Council
on the
Continuing Education Unit

by

Jewell R. Calderon
Assitant Professor and
Interim Director
Continuing Education Program in Nursing
Medical College of Virginia of
Virginia Commonwealth University

Dr. Enell has spoken to you generally about setting up to award Continuing Education Units and specifically about awarding Continuing Education Units by the American Management Associations. I am going to share information with you concerning the procedures set up by a university for awarding CEUs.

In order for you to understand some of the forms and procedures used by Virginia Commonwealth University, I am going to tell you a little about our University. Virginia Commonwealth University is a state-aided, urban university located in Richmond, Virginia. More than 19,000 students attend classes for academic credit offered by the twelve schools within the University. The first Continuing Education Program, with a full-time Director, in the University, was established in the School of Nursing in 1966. Presently eleven of our twelve schools have continuing education programs with at least one administrative position funded by state monies. Continuing Education Programs at Virginia Commonwealth University are set up to be administratively responsible to thier respective schools. That is the Director of Continuing Education in Nursing reports to the Dean of the School of Nursing. However, we have a Center for Continuing Education serving the entire University. This Center provides the means of coordinating all continuing education. The Associate Vice President for Continuing Studies located in the Center chairs a university-wide Continuing Education

Committee with membership composed of an administrator from all the Continuing Education Programs. This Committee provides a forum for information to be desiminated and problems related to continuing education to be discussed and resolved. Some policies and procedures are developed and/or revised by this Committee. Other times task forces are appointed to solve a particular problem or plan for the future of continuing education in the University. Perhaps the most important function of the Continuing Education Center is the approval system and the mechanism for peer review. We will discuss this in more detail later in the presentation.

Virginia Commonwealth University, as most other universities, has experienced a rapid expansion of continuing education offerings in the past few years. For example, in the fiscal year, 1977-1978, offerings for awarding continuing education units totaled 469, accommodating 12,476 participants as compared to the previous year with 364 offerings and 10,298 participants. The first CEUs awarded by Virginia Commonwealth University measured the achievement of students attending a School of Nursing activity in 1972. In our seven years of experience in awarding CEUs, we have had relatively little difficulty. However, we have changed some of our forms and we continue to seek improvement in our system.

One of our long-standing problems, already identified in this conference as common to other disciplines, is finding better ways of communicating information to nurses about the CEU. Many nurses are confused concerning CEUs and academic semester or quarter hours. Some are under the impresssion they can translate one into the other or apply CEUs toward a degree. We use a variety of means to enlighten students. I am frequently invited to speak to professional nursing groups, faculties of schools of nursing, and undergraudate student bodies concerning continuing education. During these presentations I always include information about the CEU. We publish a brochure of the upcoming offerings of our Continuing Education Program and mail it, yearly, to all registered nurses licensed to practice

in Virginia. Some space in this brochure is devoted to explaining the CEU. In addition, we publish articles in nursing journals addressing CEU measurement of activity in continuing education. Included in your handout material is a pamphlet published by the Center for Continuing Education at Virginia Commonwealth University. These pamphlets are available for distribution to students attending our continuing education activities. You may wish to design something like this for your students.

I am now going to discuss the forms Virginia Commonwealth University utilizes for the purpose of awarding CEUs. Samples of these forms are included in your handout material. You may decide to revise some of them for use in your university or agency. The first form is the Continuing Education Unit Activity Form (CE-1). Administrators of Continuing Education Programs at Virginia Commonwealth University initiate this form after they have identified a learning need and designed an activity to meet that need. When I am in the planning stage of an activity my most helpful resource is the booklet published by the Council on the Continuing Education Unit outlining the criteria and guidelines for awarding CEUs. You have received this publication in your conference material and it should be very valuable to you. When I follow these guidelines, I have protected the quality of my learning experience and I have sufficient information to complete the approval form. You will note at the bottom of the CE-1 form that it is submitted in triplicate to the Center for Continuing Education. This provides for a second check on the quality of the program. A person well grounded in principles of adult education reviews the form, paying special attention to the objectives identified and the evaluation procedures outlined. Any questions emerging concerning the activity are discussed with the initiator of the form and revisions are made, if necessary. The approval form is then signed and one copy is returned to the Program from which is was initiated indicating that the learning experience has been approved for implementation and for the award of CEUs to participants. The remaining copies are

retained in the Continuing Education Center for the time being.

The next form in your packet is the student Registration Form (C-3). I believe most of the information required for completing this form is self-explanatory as was the approval form we just discussed. This form solicits the student's social security number for recording and retrieval purposes. However, if a student does not wish to divulge his/her social security number, we use other means of recording. The registration form has an original and three copies. Students may keep the last copy for their files, returning the remainder of the completed form to the registration desk. At the end of the activity we give each student an unofficial record of the CEUs awarded appropriately signed by the administrator of the Continuing Education Program. You have a sample of this form in your material.

The next form in your packet is the official roster of the activity (CE-4). All students completing registration forms are listed on this roster. However, in the "Remarks" column students can be identified who registered but did not complete requirements for the award of CEUs. The instructor of the activity or administrator of the program is responsible for verifying that the roster is correct, since it is used for recording CEUs by the Office of the Registrar.

Perhaps by this time you are confused concerning the final destination of all the copies of the forms we have been discussing. We will go over that again. A set of forms (CE-1; C-3 and CE-4) is filed in the office of the Continuing Education Program that sponsored the activity. Another set is kept on file in the Continuing Education Center and a third set is sent to the Office of the Registrar for recording and transcripting purposes.

The final handout I have given you is not utilized in the process of recording CEUs. It lists the purpose and review procedure of Virginia Commonwealth University's Continuing Education Unit Standards Committee. I mentioned earlier that continuing education educators at our University are continually interested in improving the quality of the non-credit offerings. A committee was assigned the responsibility of

conducting a study in this area. The committee recommended that a review procedure be set up for assuring conformance of all Continuing Education Programs in the University to the high standards required by Virginia Commonwealth University in awarding CEUs to students involved in non-credit continuing education. I strongly suggest that you build such a review process into your system.

I thank you for your attention and I will be happy to answer any questions you may have about the remarks I have made.

RECORD KEEPING AND REPORTING

By

Lloyd Joyner
Registrar and Director of Admissions
Georgia Southern College

Continuing Education, for the purpose of definition, includes all institutions and organizational learning experiences in organized formats that impart noncredit education to the post-secondary level learner. Continuing Education in some arenas has been limited to the adult learner. There is, however, a trend for continuing education to include all non-academic learning experiences without regard to age or educational background.

The concept of continuing education has expanded rapidly over the past three decades. Individuals in ever increasing numbers are participating in evening classes, short courses, workshops, seminars, conferences, institutes, and other forms of continuing education. Professional societies and organizations develop programs and award certificates to encourage members to update their knowledge and skills. In many occupational fields, evidence of continued learning is required for maintenance of membership or certification for occupational advancement and for recognition of personal and professional development.

As millions of people each year update and upgrade their knowledge, the need for an accurate and current record of progress becomes evident. Horace Mann is quoted as having stated that a "record is a powerful incentive to good and dissuasive from evil." The value of a permanent record of academic progress has long been recognized, but equally

significant is the fact that a record keeping system of necessity has evolved whereby records are produced and maintained.

Without records there can be no measure of educational activity, either as to quantity or quality. When records exist, it is possible on a large scale to detect trends in needs.

We have come to accept as given the strength of our public education system. Much of that strength depends upon the existence of the record-keeping system—for the acquisition and allocation of funds, for the evaluation and improvement of programs, for the assurance of quality through accreditation, for the ability of educational attainment through the recognition of valid credentials. Without records there could be education but no educational system.

Record systems now are a basic part of elementary and secondary education and also that segment of postsecondary education that takes place in formal college courses for credit. (Credit itself being a byproduct of the educational record-keeping system.) There is a need also for a record-keeping system for the millions of adults who are involved in continuing education.

Results of a study conducted by Dr. John A. Rhodes, Jr. of Memphis State University revealed that a majority of accredited colleges and universities will be awarding CEU's and maintaining permanent records for program participants and their earned units. The conclusions of his study point to a clear indication of an upward trend in the use of the CEU and the importance of developing a reliable and standardized system

of record keeping.

Since the first annual meeting of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO) in 1910, a constant concern for quality and adequacy of academic records from which transcripts can be made has been evident. AACRAO publication, Academic Record and Guide, is published for users in the production and management of records and transcripts. The guide includes a comprehensive list of essential and optional data elements. Its purpose is to encourage institutions to include data elements that are commonly needed by users of academic records and recipients of transcripts made from them.

Just as a system developed for recording academic credit earned by students attending colleges and universities, an analogous system is essential to measure and record output of noncredit educational activities.

In July, 1968, a National Planning Conference on the Feasibility of the Uniform Crediting and Certifying System for Continuing Education was held in Washington, D.C. The conference was co-sponsored by the National University Extension Association, the United States Office of Education, the United States Civil Service Commission, and the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers. Thirty-four organizations from education, government, business, labor and the professions were represented. The two day conference resulted in the creation of the National Task Force on the Continuing Education Unit to determine the feasibility of a uniform unit of measurement.

The Task Force developed the concept of the continuing education

unit, published an Interim Statement and supervised pilot projects in fourteen institutions of higher education. From these processes, criteria and guidelines were recommended as a basis for implementing the Continuing Education Unit as a uniform national standard of measurement for noncredit continuing education.

One continuing education unit (CEU) is defined as ten contact hours of participation in an organized continuing education experience, under responsible sponsorship, capable direction, and qualified instruction.

In December, 1971, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools became the first regional accrediting association to adopt the CEU. Higher education institutions within the states making up the Southern Association which provide learning experiences and training through continuing education activities must adopt the CEU and report continuing education participants as part of the institutional enrollment count to the Association. Institutions seeking accreditation and accredited institutions participating in the required periodic review process of the Association will be judged under Standard Nine of the Association Standards. Standard Nine requires that "Noncredit programs should be appropriately identified and recorded by means of the continuing education unit" and that they be a part of the annual full-time equivalent enrollment information collected from member institutions. The noncredit enrollment data requested would include all noncredit special activities sponsored by the institution for the entire academic year counted for in terms of the CEU.

Standard Nine further states that policies should be developed for admissions, registration procedures, counseling and guidance services

and records. The characteristics of these policies should be directly related to the nature, character, and need of the special activities student.

The student successfully completing a special activity for which a CEU is awarded needs to have the institution record his participation for further use.

In addition to defining and delineating the continuing education unit, the National Task Force continued its work and included among other objectives a system of measuring, recording, and reporting for continuing education. The nationally accepted unit of measurement (CEU) provides a uniform system for accumulating statistical data at local, state, and national levels on the total amount of participation in continuing education activities. The system further provided for the accumulating, updating, and transferring of the continuing education record of an individual.

The unit can be applied with equal facility to professional continuing education, both vocational retraining, and adult liberal education as well as other programs in adult and continuing education.

Other major objectives were to encourage long range educational goals in continuing education as a process of life long learning for individuals, for professional groups and by institutions to make the pursuit of knowledge more attractive as a way of personal and professional development and provide a framework within which an individual can develop at his desired pace and to permit and to encourage adult students to marshall and utilize a host of continuing education resources to serve his particular needs.

In the absence of universally recognized unit of measure, the concept of education as a continuous process is often lost. This lack of any cumulative record results in most continuing education programs being built upon narrowly defined educational objectives and the establishment of only short term goals.

Thus the purpose of the CEU is to provide a mechanism by which most continuing education activities can be recorded. It is not expected on the other hand that all of the participation in terms of continuing education units will have utility or transferability in terms of individual programs for career development. There would appear to be definite institutional and other sponsor advantages in qualifying and recording the total amount of continuing education activity for which such organizations are responsible.

Standard Nine requires that the permanent CEU record be established after a person has applied, gains admittance, registers and pays fees for a course meeting the Southern Association's criteria for awarding of an individual CEU.

The CEU record is expected to reflect the essential data elements recommended by AACRAO and many of the optional data elements as are necessary to satisfy institutional policies as well as academic and administrative needs. The CEU record should also reflect courses attempted, grades and credit earned expressed in continuing education units.

Cumulative records for each individual participant must be available on a permanent basis and are to be issued as an official statement or

transcript upon request of the participant. The following data elements are categorized for purposes of maintaining continuing education unit records as either essential or optional. Essential data elements: identification of the sponsoring organization, name and date of birth of the student, prior education, course number, title or brief description of program activity, date and/or length of program or activity, qualitative or quantitative evaluation of individual's performance, number of CEU's awarded. Optional data element: participant's address, place of birth, identification number, employment status, location of program activity, data element description of program activity. In addition to the title, a brief description including a record of program content, level, objective, format, instructor's name as well a brief syllabus of the program itself should also be retained.

The registrar of the institution, or official custodian of records, has the responsibility of developing and enforcing security measures to protect educational records from accidental damage, destruction, or deliberate alteration.

Requests of students for official transcripts must be honored. Each official transcript must be authenicated with the signature and title of the certifying official, the seal of the institution or issuing officer, the date of issue, the statement informing parties to whom transcripts are sent that it is not permissible to release information from the transcripts to a third party as required by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 as amended, and the notation "issured to student" if this is the case. Further details as to producing and maintaining continuing education records on individual participants and

release of transcripts may be found in AACRAO's Academic Record and Transcript Guide.

CEU PARTICIPANT EVALUATION AND QUALITY ASSURANCE

BY

Irman Bolte, Assistant Dean
Continuing Education, College of Nursing
University of Kentucky

I am honored and pleased to be with you to discuss participant evaluation and quality assurance in continuing nursing education. My frame of reference is that of a continuing education nurse administrator in a collegiate school of nursing.

One of the most pervasive themes in continuing nursing education today is the need to evaluate how well the goals of continuing education are achieved. I am pleased to report that evaluation is receiving considerable attention from those who plan continuing nursing education offerings. These persons point to a need for establishing the worth or value of their efforts and are unwilling to leave evaluation of the effectiveness of their continuing nursing education offerings to chance. They insist that evaluation of the outcomes of a continuing nursing education offering be planned. They agree with the concept that evaluation must be built in from the very beginning that planning of the continuing nursing education offering takes place and that it continue beyond the length of the offering itself. Popiel, an authority on continuing nursing education states that evaluation of a course may take as long as three years.

Five recent trends have increased the need for goal directed evaluation in continuing nursing education. They are:

1. The increasing number of continuing nursing education providers within the past few years. This group includes colleges, universities, nursing organizations, health-related organizations, state and local health departments, hospitals, private individuals and commercial agencies.

2. The wide variety of formats in which continuing nursing education is offered, e.g., institutes, conferences, short courses, seminars which range in length from one hour to 9 months.

3. The diversity of the target population which is made up of nurses with diverse nursing interests, education/backgrounds and years of experinece.

4. The increased confusion about the definition of continuing education and its goals. The definition of continuing education for nursing held by the planner varies with the needs of the provider and is elastic. For some planners the purpose or goal of continuing education is so broad that any continuing education is appropriate for nurses. This is most alarming in that in some states, Kentucky for example, the nurse's license to practice will depend on evidence of completing requirements of continuing education programs or earning a specified number of contact hours.

5. The increasing emphasis placed on accountability in continuing nursing education. This emphasis on accountability is stimulating more evaluation and more scrutiny of the evaluation methods used in continuing nursing education. Because the quality of continuing education offerings is a part of accountability, evaluation is expected by some to include quality assessment. However, most planners in continuing education in nursing are comfortable with the idea that if the providers of continuing education follow the American Nurses Association for continuing education the quality of the offering will be acceptable.

The last trend leads to two major issues in continuing nursing education: The first is: Should continuing nursing education offerings be evaluated in regard to their impact on health care? Proponents insist that this must be done because the ultimate goal of continuing nursing education is to improve health care. Opponents claim that since other health professionals and degree programs

in nursing are not evaluated this way, it is not necessary for continuing nursing education.

The difficulty of such evaluation is evident in that there are no evaluation models available. It is said that if basic nursing programs had the answers, they could provide the models. The question before us is: Should the continuing education thrust with limited funding, staffing and resources assume responsibility for developing these models?

A second major issue in evaluation of continuing nursing education is: Should continuing nursing education be evaluated in regard to its impact on the practice of nursing? Proponents insist this approach is indicated when a continuing nursing education offering is lengthy such as a nurse practitioner program that extends over a period of nine months. Some, however, question the appropriateness of evaluating the impact of a continuing education offering that is less than 10-20 contact hours in length.

Opponents insist that change in nursing practice is not an expectation of most continuing education offerings and that efforts expended in this direction are costly and a waste of time. They insist that the particular areas of practice and the continuing nursing education offering must have commonality for evaluation of the impact on nursing practice to be successful.

A few continuing nursing education planners have attempted to zero in on evaluating the impact of continuing education on the quality of nursing practice. A survey by Forni in 1974 resulted in the conclusion that you could not answer unequivocally that there is an effect thru continuing nursing education on the practice of nursing. While there have been additional studies since that time, the answer is not any less unequivocal. Puetz reports that continuing education can have an effect on nursing practice but does not indicate that continuing nursing education has an effect on practice. Puetz concludes that continuing

nursing education has done some good and that continuing nursing education is useful.

Because of the emphasis on goal directed evaluation, it is essential that an evaluating design be developed. I would like to share with you the design for evaluating a 3 year federally funded maternal child health project administered by the continuing education program, University of Kentucky, College of Nursing. The ultimate goal of this project is to upgrade the quality of nursing care available for mothers, infants and children in Region IV, S.E.U.S. The immediate goal is to bring about a change in the nursing practice of maternal child health nurses in Region IV; S.E.U.S. Selected evaluation models were utilized in developing the evaluation design. Our evaluation design for the project is based on these two premises:

1. The data we obtain has potential for use by the learners, project course, planners, program administrator, faculty and the federal funding agency.

2. Courses planned must meet the standards set by the American Nurses Association Accreditation program for continuing education. The National Task Force on Continuing Education, Southern Association of Colleges and Universities and the Kentucky Board of Nursing which has a mandatory continuing education requirement for licensure renewal.

The evaluation design includes these four components of goal directed evaluation: Reaction to the offering, increased knowledge, change in behavior and impact on practice. I will briefly discuss each component and identify the evaluation tools selected.

1. Reaction to the offering. This component refers to the participants' self-perception of learning and their satisfaction with the offering. The data obtained do not measure learning or application of learning. The data provides information for decision making for the learning, program planner and faculty. The specific tool devised to evaluate the reaction to the offering is a reactionnaire.

(This tool uses a quantitative rating scale, e.g., rating on a 5 point scale. The form invites additional comments e.g., recommendations on how the workshop could be improved). The reactionnaire also will provide the project with some data on the effect of the classroom climate on participant satisfaction. A copy of this form has been made available to you. (This tool is the standard form of approach for most providers of continuing nursing education and is often referred to as the happiness index form).

2. The second component is increased knowledge. This refers to how much the participant actually learned from the continuing education offering. The maternal child health project gives a pre-test and a post-test for each course offering. The pre-test post-test is given to determine if the participants know more about the content of the course than they would have without the course. This tool is used frequently by continuing nursing education planners in academic settings.

3. The third component is change in behavior. This component refers to what the participants actually do when they are back on the job, i.e., do they apply the new principles and skills they have learned in their actual work setting. The work environment is recognized as the most important factor influencing how the participants will apply their learning. The tool devised for this component is a self-report we call "passport to learning." Each participant is directed to identify three changes they would like to accomplish in their practice as a result of the course and cite their plans for accomplishing these changes. We suggest that they contract with a learning partner (a participant in the same course and discuss how they are implementing their objectives monthly for 3 continuous months. At the end of this time the participant makes a summary and returns it to the project staff, if the nurse participant has been able to implement her individual objectives and goals into improved nursing practice.)

4. The fourth component is impact on practice. This component refers to the impact of the continuing education course in terms of the ultimate and immediate purposes which motivated the course in the first place. This is the most difficult type of evaluation to accomplish at present and utilizes a control group to determine if a particular result is due to the continuing education course or some other change e.g., a change in policy. The tool here is a delayed post-test which is administered to participants and a control group. Performance of the two groups will be compared. A second tool is the supervisor's questionnaire This tool asks for the supervisor's opinion of the participant's knowledge and skill in the work-setting. A third tool, the follow-up participant questionnaire if for use by the participant in evaluating the effectiveness of the course. We realize that the tools used to measure the impact on patient care could be classified in components 1,2, and 3. However, we are utilizing these in components to generate new ideas and data that will lead to the construction of more effective, valid and reliable evaluation instruments for this component which is the most important of all.

In conclusion, the state of the art in evaluating for continuing nursing education is less than perfect. The reactionaire is the most frequently used tool. There is a questionable relationship between increase in knowledge and improved nursing practice as measured by pre-tests and post-tests. The self-report may well be the best tool for evaluating change in behavior. Evaluation of the impact on practice component could be enhanced with unlimited funds that would allow for on-site evaluation of patient care outcomes.

THE STATUS OF MANDATORY CONTINUING EDUCATION

BY

LOUIS E. PHILLIPS

The trust and confidence of professionals that in the past was almost total and without question, is now everybody's business. Physicians, lawyers, architects, engineers and others are now being pummeled by various elements of society. A special report in Business Week (August 16, 1976) entitled "The Troubled Professions" summarized this growing change:

"In a sense, the gap between what the professions can deliver and what the public expects them to deliver results from two trends beyond their control: technological complexity and egalitarianism. Both trends are forcing a thoroughgoing reassessment of how well professionals do their jobs and a redefining of what it is they do. The outcome of that reassessment will have great impact not only on professionals, but on society as well."

To ease these pressures, professionals are taking a closer look at how they maintain their competencies during their productive lives. One solution has been increased continuing education - either voluntary or mandatory. While there has been a significant increase during the past decade in mandatory continuing education, there likewise has been a similar growth in voluntary participation in continuing education by professionals.

Patterns of Participation

There appear three distinct patterns of continuing education participation by professionals. They are:

1) Voluntary participation.

2) Participation required as a condition of membership, employment or certification.

3) Mandatory participation required for relicensure or recertification.

Voluntary Participation

Voluntary participation in continuing education might be considered the first generation of the mandatory movement. My estimate is that perhaps 60 - 75 percent of the licensed professionals in any one profession voluntarily participate in some form of organized continuing education activity of a regular basis.

Often such participation is documented via a certificate of completion and/or some form of special recognition. One of the better known programs in the U.S. is the Physician's Recognition Award Program conducted by the American Medical Association. Physicians who complete 150 hours of continuing medical education within a three-year period qualify for a certificate. Over 40,000 physicians have qualified for this award since the program was instituted in 1968. Similar programs have been adopted by other health professions.

Participation Required as a Condition of Membership

While continuing education participation as a condition of membership, employment or recertification is not as prevalent as the other two forms, it does appear to be growing among the professions - particularly in the medical specialty areas, dentistry, and the allied health professions. Twenty state medical societies and nine state dental societies have such membership requirements. Seven of AMA's medical specialty societies have similar membership requirements. All 22 of AMA's medical specialty boards

have established a policy of recertification, which I understand will be a combination of required continuing education and reexamination.

Mandatory Participation

Whereas professionals are generally licensed by individual states, mandatory continuing education is likewise a state decision, both in the design and maintenance of such a requirement. While some states have shown more activity toward mandatory continuing education than others, there does not appear to be any specific geographical pattern to such mandatory statutes.

An analysis of the number of states that have statutes requiring mandatory continuing education for various professions is as follows:

45 states for optometrists

40 states for nursing home administrators

28 states for certified public accountants

22 states for veterinarians

21 states for osteopaths

20 states for physicians

19 states for pharmacists

11 states for dentists

10 states for real estate salesmen/brokers

9 states for nurses

7 states for dental hygienists

6 states for social workers

6 states for lawyers (plus another 3 have specialization requirements)

4 states for physical therapists

1 state for engineers

While a great deal of attention has been given to mandatory continuing education, there has been a parallel movement among professional and trade associations to institute certification programs. A number of occupational groups that have such programs are:

Quality Control
Secretaries
Legal Secretaries
Internal Auditors
Financial Analysts
Financial Planners
Managers
Production and Inventory Control
Materials Handling and Management
Manufacturing Engineers
Purchasing Agents
Data Processing
Traffic and Transportation
Maintenance
Personnel Directors
Dieticians
Auto Mechanics

The Legality of Mandatory Continuing Education

Ever since the implementation of mandatory continuing education, legal challenges have been made. The first such test in the U.S. was in West Virginia in 1898, which was upheld by the courts in a challenge by a physician. Other landmark cases are found in California in 1941, in Wisconsin in 1947, as well as more recent cases.

There are cases where mandatory statutes have been held invalid. The principal reason for the failure of these statutes was when the authority was delegated to a professional society instead of a state licensing board. In one such case in New York, the court ruled:

"While private professional societies may and do act in an advisory capacity and make recommendations to the state boards and the department of education in matters affecting their profession, they have no independent

power to establish mandatory standards for professional licenses. Finally, the court held that this was unconstitutional delegation of governmental powers to a private corporation representing the interest of the members of the professional society." (Podiatry Society vs. Regents)

(The above material was taken from a presentation by Harold Leslie on October 23, 1975, to the 1975 University of South Florida Graduate Accounting Conference on the subject of Continuing Professional Education.)

The Implementation of Mandatory Statutes

Mandatory continuing education is often a highly emotional and political issue for a profession. While consumers are increasingly vocal about the professions, it is the "self-imposed" pressures of the individual professions that generally lead to the passage of a mandatory statute. This self-imposed pressure generally stems from the majority of the profession that want to protect the profession from the lazy or complacent few who represent potential embarrassment and harm to the profession. The tradition of a profession policing itself or determining its own destiny is very much in evidence in the passage of a mandatory statute.

The majority of members of a given profession who regularly participate in continuing education realize that such a requirement has very little effect on their current participation. Those who argue that mandatory continuing education does not necessarily improve competency, tend to forget the vast amount of voluntary participation that the majority of a profession's members have chosen to upgrade their skills and knowledge.

Continuing professional education continues to gain acceptance as the most appropriate means to improve competency. Just as we assume that exercise leads to a healthier and longer life, we know that other factors such as diet, stress, and our environment are also key factors. Work experience, informal

learning, experimentation and other factors likewise lead to improved competencies, yet little has been done to quantify and measure such factors in the professions. Some pioneering efforts are being made in these areas however.

Continuing education, whether or not the most appropriate means to improve one's competencies, is perhaps the most convenient method at present. It is usually available and accessible - characterized by flexibility of time, location, format, delivery, and price.

Statutes requiring mandatory continuing education either specify the amount of continuing education required for relicensure, or leave the amount up to the licensing agency. The latter approach of granting the licensing agency the authority to set the standard allows more flexibility in changing a requirement. Some states have passed omnibus legislation regarding mandatory continuing education. For example, the Iowa state legislature has granted authority to all of its licensing bodies to implement mandatory continuing education, while the Kansas and Arkansas state legislatures granted similar authority to all of the healing arts licensing agencies.

Considerable variation is found among the states in the amount of required continuing education; however, there appears a movement toward more uniformity in such requirements. Most national professional associations are collecting data from the various states and are able to assist states with information that are considering passing similar statutes. Some professional associations are developing standard practice acts in order to achieve a greater degree of uniformity.

A major shortcoming of most mandatory statutes is the failure to examine the amount of available continuing education and its accessibility to all

members of the profession before a requirement is set. Professionals in remote areas are usually discriminated against because of the time, distance, and added expense of attending a continuing education activity. Programmers prefer to use locations in urban areas because it enhances the chances of a program materializing. Programmers are often reluctant to develop new delivery systems for rural areas because of the greater risk and expense in developing and delivering such programs. Also educators have traditionally felt the use of a live instructor with a group was more effective than a home-study package or long distance telephone, radio or television teaching.

Once a mandatory statute is passed, it generally takes from one to three years before the law can become fully operational. Numerous details have to be worked out by the licensing agency and often additional personnel added to handle the additional work load. Often this creates a considerable hardship as most licensing agencies are already understaffed, under financed, and overworked.

To insure that quality standards are maintained in continuing professional education, the matter of accreditation must often be addressed. Which programs and which program sponsors will be recognized as worthy? Several approaches are used.

1) No Controls

   The licensing agency accepts any program that appears relevant to the professional, regardless of the program sponsor.

2) Accreditation of Sponsors

   All programs offered by specified program sponsors (such as certain professional associations, higher education institutions, or other accredited sponsors) are acceptable. This may or may not result in a formal review process.

3) Program Approval

Each program must be submitted for approval in advance of the offering for approval by the licensing agency.

A combination of these approaches is sometimes used, particularly with professional associations that develop certification programs. Often professional associations establish separate categories of programs in which individuals are granted minimums and/or maximums in differing categories that may be used to qualify for recertification such as (1) accredited programs, (2) non-accredited formal learning programs, (3) independent studies, (4) papers authored, and (5) journal readings.

Measures

A variety of measurement systems for continuing education has arisen. These include (1) classroom or contact hours, (2) points (usually related to hours), and (3) continuing education units (CEUs).

While the contact or classroom hour is perhaps the most popular at this time, the CEU (one CEU is equivalent to ten contact hours) has rapidly gained momentum since its introduction in the early 1970's. The CEU is certainly the most popular method of continuing education measure used by colleges and universities. The advantage of the CEU is that it is the only measurement system that has an established set of national criteria and guidelines that applies to all modes of continuing education.

Documentation of Participation

Various methods are used to document participation. The most common method is for the participant to submit a list of their participation to the licensing agency at the time of relicensure. This appears the least costly

method of record keeping; however, it is quite vulnerable to fradulent information. Another approach requires the program sponsor to verify participation directly to the licensing agency upon the conclusion of the program. This method requires the licensing agency to continually post each individual's participation throughout the licensing period.

What Has Been the Result of all of this Required Continuing Education so far as Education Is Concerned?

1) Everybody and his brother is now in the business.

2) It has become big business - much bigger than any of us realize.

3) Professions are finding renewed interest in the profession and its activities, especially when continuing education is on the program.

4) Some professionals are being "ripped" off by fly-by-night programs.

5) It is becoming quite obvious that many people involved in developing and conducting programs don't know what they're doing.

6) There are many positive results, but very little documentation to support the positive aspects.

7) There is still a great deal of opposition.

8) Focused attention on the whole question of competency.

The July, 1978 issue of the AMERICAN DRUGGIST carried the results of a survey of twelve states that required mandatory continuing education for pharmacists. Entitled "Mandatory Continuing Education Gets Low Marks From Many Pharmacists," the by-line stated "fewer than half the RPh's are happy with programs available to them. Most approve the idea in principle, but see the reality as a 'farce', Waste of time', or 'ripoff'."

Alternatives to Continuing Education

In spite of the rapid growth of mandatory continuing education during the 1970's, there remain many skeptics who question the validity of continuing education as the dominant means of insuring continuing competency.

Cohen and Miike, writing in the International Journal of Health Services, noted that "compulsory continuing education should not be over-simplified or accepted as a panacea. There are still basic questions . . . whether traditional forms of continuing education have any significant relationship to quality assurance."

(Cohen, Harris S. and Miike, Lawrence H., "Toward a More Responsive System of Professional Licensure," International Journal of Health Services, Vol. 4, No. 2, 1974, p.268)

A similar warning was issued by Selden during a conference on mandatory continuing education:

"Although continuing professional competence has been increasing in importance, we have not yet been able to define such competence with reasonable precision nor measure it with adequate accuracy. Despite these limitations, mandated continuing education is being established as a requirement for recertification and/or relicensure in a growing number of professions on the unproven assumption that mere participation in continuing education programs provides reasonable assurance of continuing competence."

(Selden, William K., "Implications for Society of Mandatory Continuing Education for the Professions". Address at Conference on Mandatory Continuing Education for the Professions in Texas. Held at Southern Methodist University, Dallas, June 21, 1976.)

Some alternatives to the sole use of continuing education being proposed are:

1) Periodic reassessment (written exams, peer reviews, case record reviews, and simulations).

2) Job analysis studies.

3) Analysis of critical incidents of professionals.

4) Simulations (Patient Management Problem).

5) Self-assessment testing.

(Schimberg, Benjamin, "Continuing Education and Continued Competence in the Licensed Professions." Presentation to the 32nd National Conference on Higher Education, Chicago, March 21, 1977.)

While these alternatives are primarily methods of assessing strengths or weaknesses of a professional's competencies, they do point out the fact that education occurs in many ways - both formally and informally.

"It is in fact nothing short of a miracle that the modern methods of instruction have not yet entirely strangled the holy curiosity of inquiry . . . " --Albert Einstein

As we begin to explore further the relationship of continuing education and competency via analytical methods, it is my belief that the concept of continuing education will be enhanced as the dominant means of competency maintenance. Such findings will no doubt result in new approaches to continuing education processes, measures, and delivery systems.

Louis E. Phillips
Furman University
Continuing Education
Greenville, SC 29613